Our current tax policies are out of synch with our trade policies and the realities of the global marketplace. In the early 1960s, U.S. companies focused their manufacturing and marketing strategies in the United States, which at the time was the largest consumer market in the world. U.S. companies generally could achieve economies of scale and rapid growth-selling exclusively into the domestic market. In the early 1960s, foreign competition in U.S. markets generally was inconsequential.

The picture today is completely different. First, U.S. companies now face strong competition at home. Since 1980, foreign direct investment in the United States has increased by a factor of six (from $216 billion to $752 billion in 1997), and imports have tripled as a share of GDP from an average of 3.2 percent in the 1960s to an average of over 9.6 percent over the 1990 97 period.

Second, foreign markets are more attractive today than they were in the past. For example, from 1986 to 1997, foreign sales of S&P 500 companies grew 10 percent a year, compared to domestic sales growth of just 3 percent annually. Foreign markets also afford increasingly attractive investment opportunities.

From the perspective of the 1960s, there was little apparent reason for U.S. companies to direct resources to penetrating foreign markets, since U.S. companies should achieve growth and profit levels that were the envy of their competitors with minimal foreign operations. By contrast, in today's economy, competitive success requires U.S. companies to execute global marketing and manufacturing strategies with the result that provisions of our tax system designed when foreign operations were viewed as presumptively tax-motivated have become increasingly outmoded.

It is because of the great changes in global trade that we involved ourselves in this issue. The current rules guiding our international tax policies were written at a time when the focus was on preventing tax avoidance, not on promoting international competitiveness. Our main goal this year is to build on the successes that we had in the 105th Congress. This will be our fourth bill in this area, and our third with our Senate counterparts, Senators HATCH and BAUCUS. It includes some new provisions, but in many ways reflects the reality that much has been done to correct some of the problems facing U.S. industries in this arena, but there is a great deal of work left to be done.

Our first order of business is to simplify the international tax regime to ensure American competitiveness both at home and abroad. The tax provisions that we are introducing today will significantly affect the national welfare and will enhance the participation of the United States in the global economy of the 21st century. I look forward to working with my House and Senate colleagues to pass this important piece of legislation into law.

THE ASSOCIATION HOUSE OF CHICAGO CELEBRATES 100 YEARS

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1999

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Association House of Chicago as it celebrates its 100th anniversary on June 8, 1999. Association House has been serving the community I represent since before the turn of the century. It was founded by more than one hundred women and served as a settlement house and social service agency for immigrants arriving in Chicago.

Throughout its century of public service, the mission and goals of Association House of Chicago have expanded. Association House continues to provide vital services, programs and assistance to families, children, seniors and immigrants throughout our community. Each year, Association House assists nearly 20,000 individuals and families throughout the Chicago area, providing services ranging from the most basic of necessities to managing larger government contracts. The expansion of Association House's services during the past two decades led the agency to buy a second facility last year. This growth helps immigrants take naturalization classes, learn English and master trades.

In addition to the programs Association House offers in education, citizenship and job readiness training, Association House offers after-school programs and activities for children. The agency also provides foster care and adoption services, addiction recovery programs and provides emergency food and clothing. The staff of Association House is truly dedicated to their programs and the people they benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Association House of Chicago for building a strong tradition of service toward others. The work that Association House has accomplished since its first days cannot be measured. For one hundred years, Association House has been assisting, teaching and counseling people of all ages, races, cultures and ethnic backgrounds. From preparing people to enter the workforce to teaching them to speak English to caring for at-risk children, Association House has served as a shining beacon of hope in Chicago. I am honored to commend Association House on a century of unequaled service to the people of our city.

INTERNATIONAL TAX SIMPLIFICATION FOR AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1999

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1999

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by my colleagues, Messrs. LEVIN, SAM JOHNSON, HERGER, MATSUI, CRANE, and ENGLISH in introducing our bill, ''International Tax Simplification for American Competitiveness Act of 1999''. The world economy is globalizing at a pace unforseen only a few years ago. Our trade laws and practices have encouraged the expansion of U.S. business interests abroad, but our tax policy lags decades behind—in fact, in many cases, our international tax policy seems to promote consequences that are contrary to the national interest.

In the 1960s, the United States accounted for more than 50 percent of cross-border direct investment. By the mid-1990s, that share had dropped to about 25 percent. Similarly, of the world's 20 largest corporations (ranked by sales), 18 were U.S.-headquartered in 1960. By the mid-1990s, that number had dropped to eight. The 21,000 foreign affiliates of U.S. multinationals now compete with about 260,000 foreign affiliates of multinationals headquartered in other nations. The declining dominance of U.S.-headquartered multinationals is dramatically illustrated by the recent acquisitions of Amoco by British Petroleum, the acquisition of Chrysler by Daimler-Benz, the acquisition of Bankers Trust by Deutsche Bank, and the acquisition of Case by New Holland. These mergers have the effect of converting U.S. multinationals to foreign-headquartered companies.

Ironically, despite the decline of U.S. dominance of world markets, the U.S. economy is far more dependent on foreign direct investment than ever before. In the 1960s, foreign operations averaged just 7.5 percent of U.S. corporate net income. By contrast, over the 1990–97 period, foreign earnings represented 17.7 percent of all U.S. corporate net income.

Over the last three decades, the U.S. share of the world's export market has declined. In 1960, one of every six dollars of world exports originated from the United States. By 1996, the United States supplied only one of every nine dollars of world export sales. Despite a 30 percent loss in world export market share, the U.S. economy now depends on exports to a much greater degree. During the 1960s, only 3.2 percent of national income was attributable to exports, compared to 7.5 percent over the 1990–97 period.

Foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies play a critical role in boosting U.S. exports—by marketing, distributing, and finishing U.S. products in foreign markets. U.S. Commerce Department data show that in 1996 U.S. mulitnational companies were involved in 65 percent of all U.S. merchandise export sales. In the 1960s, the foreign operations of U.S. companies were sometimes viewed as disconnected from the U.S. economy or, worse, as competing with domestic production and jobs. In today's highly integrated global economy, economic evidence points to a positive correlation between U.S. investment abroad and U.S. exports.

At the end of the 20th century, we confront an economy in which U.S. multinationals face far greater competition in global markets, yet rely on these markets for a much larger share of profits and sales, than was the case even a few years ago. In light of these changed circumstances, the effects of tax policy on the competitiveness of U.S. companies operating abroad is potentially of far greater consequence today than was formerly the case.

As we begin the process of re-examining in fundamental ways our income tax system, we believe it imperative to address the area of international taxation. In an Internal Revenue Code stuffed with eye-glazing complexity, there is probably no area that contains as many difficult and complicated rules as international taxation. Further, I cannot stress enough the importance of continued discussion between the Congress and Treasury of simplifying our international tax laws; and in making more substantial progress in regard to eliminating particular anomalies such as with the allocation of interest expense between domestic and foreign source income for computation of the foreign tax credit or in regard to how our antiquated tax rules deal with new integrated trade areas such as the European Union.

None of us is under any illusion that the measure which we introduced removes all complexity or breaks bold new conceptual ground. We believe, however, that the enactment of this legislation would be a significant step in the right direction. The legislation would enhance the ability of America to continue to be the preeminent economic force in the world. If our economy is to continue to create jobs for its citizens, we must ensure that the foreign provisions of the United States income tax law do not stand in the way.

There are many aspects of the current system that should be reformed and greatly improved. These reforms would significantly lower the cost of capital, the cost of administration, and therefore the cost of doing business for U.S.-based firms. This bill addresses a number of such problems, including significant anomalies and provisions whose administrative effects burden both the taxpayers and the government.

The focus of the legislation is to put some rationalization to the international tax area. In general, the bill seeks in modest but important ways to: (1) simplify this overly complex area, especially in subpart F of the Code and the foreign tax credit mechanisms; (2) encourage exports; (3) enhance U.S. competitiveness in other industrialized countries.

The bill would, among other necessary and important adjustments, make permanent the provision regarding the subpart F exception for active financial services income, modify other provisions that apply subpart F of the Code in inappropriate ways, eliminate double taxation by extending the periods to which excess foreign tax credits may be carried, restore symmetry to the treatment of domestic and foreign losses, and make needed adjustments to the so-called ''10/50 company'' provisions that burden the joint venture relationships that many of our companies form in their international business relations.

In summary, the law as now constituted frustrates the legitimate goals and objective of American business and erects artificial and unnecessary barriers to U.S. competitiveness. Neither the largest U.S. based multinational companies nor the Internal Revenue Service is in a position to administer and interpret the mine numbing complexity of many of the foreign provisions. Why not then move toward creating a set of international tax rules which taxpayers can understand, and the government can administer? Therefore the proposed changes we believe represent a creditable package and a ''down payment'' on further reform in the international tax area. We urge our colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRED COLONEL ALICE GRITSAVAGE

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1999

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take notice of a special citizen, Retired Colonel Alice Gritsavage. She is a one of a kind person that deserves special recognition.

Ms. Gritsavage resides in my hometown of Ocala, Florida and she has had a remarkable life. Ms. Gritsavage served our nation as a nurse in both World War II and the Korean War. In fact, her outstanding record as an executive Army nurse in World War II influenced General Douglas McArthur to request that she be named to his staff as Chief Nurse of the Far East Command at the start of the Korean conflict.

I would like to quote from the congratulatory letter Col. Gritsavage received on the date of her departure from the Korean Command on May 28, 1953 from General Mark Clark, Commander in Chief of the United States Army at that time.

General Clark wrote:

> You had been in the theatre only a short time when the Communist aggressors threatened world peace by their unprovoked invasion of South Korea. This event required a tremendous build up of medical and hospital facilities, both in Japan and Korea, to care for the wounded of the United Nations. Since that time the standards of the Army Nurse Corps in the Command have reached a level unparalleled in the Corps. Your untiring efforts, outstanding leadership and devotion to duty have set a brilliant example and have been directly responsible for the excellent services performed by our gallant Army Nurses in this, the United Nations first armed bid for world peace.

Col. Gritsavage's dedicated service to our nation led our local chapter of Korean War Veterans to name their chapter after Ms. Gritsavage. At the time of this dedication in 1995, the Ocala chapter was the only one in the nation to be named after a woman—reflecting the importance of Col. Gritsavage to our community.

I thank Colonel Gritsavage on behalf of my district and on behalf of our nation for her wonderful service in her remarkable life.

IN HONOR OF MS. FEN LEWIS AND MS. LOIS KLAMAR FOR RECEIVING PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Fen Lewis of Strongville High School and Lois Klamar of Jamison CompuTech Center for receiving presidential teaching awards. Ms. Lewis and Ms. Klamar will receive their awards at a White House ceremony the week of June 7, 1999.

The Presidential Teaching Awards program recognizes a special group of elementary and secondary teachers for their commitment and dedication to nurturing student interest in science and mathematics. Ms. Lewis and Ms. Klamar are indeed very devoted teachers and are well deserving of these prestigious awards.

They have set an example for all teachers across the nation to follow. We need more teachers like Ms. Lewis and Ms. Klamar to help our kids strive for excellence in the classroom. The students of these two schools should be honored and proud to have these people as their teachers and role models. Both teachers are excellent representatives of their schools because of their considerable accomplishments with their students. These teachers have been presented with one of the highest honors in their field and should be given their rightful recognition.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in honoring both of these outstanding teachers on receiving presidential awards.

SIXTH REPORT OF THE SPEAKER'S TASK FORCE ON THE HONG KONG TRANSITION

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1999

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to submit the Sixth Report of the Speaker's Task Force on the Hong Kong Transition. It has been almost two years since Hong Kong reverted to Chinese sovereignty on July 1, 1997. Prior to that historic event, at the request of Speaker Gingrich, this Member formed the House Task Force on Hong Kong's Transition. In addition to myself as Chairman, the bipartisan Task Force includes Representatives HOWARD BERMAN (D–CA), SHERROD BROWN (D–OH), ENI FALEOMAVAEGA (D–AS), ALCEE HASTINGS (D–FL), DON MANZULLO (R–IL), and MATT SALMON (R–AZ).

To date, the Task Force has prepared six quarterly reports assessing how the reversion has affected Hong Kong. The sixth report, which I submit today, covers the period of October through March 31, 1999, during which time this Member, as Task Force Chairman, visited Hong Kong in January 1999.

Mr. Speaker, this Member submits the following Task Force report for the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER'S TASK FORCE ON THE HONG KONG TRANSITION, SIXTH REPORT

This is the sixth report of the Task Force on the Hong Kong Transition. It follows the first report dated October 1, 1997, the second reported dated February 25, 1998, the third report dated May 22, 1998, the fourth report dated July 23, 1998, and the fifth report dated February 2, 1999. This report focuses on events and development relevant to United States interests in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) between October 1, 1998, and March 31, 1999, and incorporates findings drawn from the Task Force Chairman's visit to Hong Kong in January, 1999.

Hong Kong's ongoing economic recession marked the six months covered by this report as the consequences of the Asian Financial Crisis continued to be felt. Hong Kong's gross domestic product (GDP) declined by 5.1 percent in real terms in 1998, its first annual contraction on record. Unemployment and trade figures were correspondingly negative. Despite the difficulties. Hong Kong authorities operated independently in all areas of economic decision making, and there was no evidence of any attempt to intervene by Beijing. Opinion on the Hong Kong government's controversial August 1998 intervention in the currency, stock and futures markets turned increasingly positive as equities regained much of their lost value and the currency exchange rate held steady.

In the legal-political realm, Chinese officials' public expressions of unhappiness over a controversial decision by Hong Kong's Court of Final Appeal raised concern about the future independence of the Hong Kong judiciary. Discussions between Hong Kong and Beijing authorities, combined with a ''clarification'' issued by the court, appeared to have succeeded in settling the matter, at least temporarily, without serious damage to the ''one country, two systems'' concept. The